

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 19-22 are pending in the application, with claims 19-22 being the independent claims. In order to expedite prosecution, claims 21 and 22 have been amended. By this amendment, Applicants do not intend to disclaim the subject matter of claims 21 and 22 and therefore, reserve the right to prosecute the subject matter of original claims 21 and 22 in a continuing application. Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Jou, et al, U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0019541 (Jou). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Jou relates to a system for the detection of zero-rate communication frames on forward and reverse communications link. (Jou, Abstract). In support of the rejection, the Examiner cites paragraph 81 of Jou which relates to the reverse communications link. (Office Action, p. 2). In Jou, the reverse communications link does not include a pilot channel which is used in the forward communications link to detect zero-rate frames. (Jou, para. [0080]). The user terminal in Jou transmits in periodic blocks of constant length. In one block, data are transmitted ("hot zone") and in the other blocks nothing is transmitted ("cold zone"). (Jou, para. [0081]). The method adapted on the reverse

communications link therefore includes dividing the reverse traffic channel frame into a first portion, the so-called "hot zone" and a second portion, the so-called "cold zone." (Jou, para. [0081]).

The user terminal transmits the zero-rated frames by transferring a predetermined code in a pseudo-randomly placed position on the reverse traffic channel frame. (Jou, para. [0081]). The zero-rate frame can be detected by comparing a scaled version of the signal energy in the cold zone with a scaled version of the signal energy in the hot zone. As described in Jou, partitioning into cold and hot zone can be achieved by using four intervals and transmitting the zero-rate frame in one of the four intervals. (Jou, para. [0081]).

In contrast, Applicants' claim 19 relates to a method of "controlling the transmission of data over a time-divided multiple access channel." An allocation scheme of the channel is determined using periodic blocks of constant length. Each of these blocks can either be occupied by one long burst or an integral number of short bursts of equal length. (Specification, p. 9, lines 5-8). The division of the blocks into slots is determined flexibly by higher level protocols. (Specification, p. 9, lines 7-8).

Thus, Jou does not teach or suggest every feature in Applicants' independent claims 19 and 20. Jou does not teach or suggest "whereby said transceivers transmit data in said channel with a format including periodic blocks of constant length each occupied by either one long burst or an integral number of short bursts of equal length," as recited in independent claim 19. Furthermore, Jou does not teach or suggest a "wireless link signal having a format including periodic blocks of constant length each occupied by

either one long burst or an integral number of short bursts of equal length," as recited in independent claim 20.

For at least the above reasons, independent claims 19 and 20 are patentable over Jou. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jou. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In order to expedite prosecution, claims 21 and 22 were amended to depend from claims 19 and 20, respectively. As discussed above, Jou does not teach or suggest every feature in Applicants' independent claims 19 and 20. Amended claim 21 depends from claim 19. Amended claim 22 depends from claim 20. For at least these reasons, and further in view of their own features, dependent claims 21 and 22 are patentable over Jou. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Conclusion


All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will

expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Lori A. Gordon
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 50,633

Date: February 6, 2006

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

455740v1